

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,982	02/20/2004	Rafail Zubok	532/5	7133
530 7	7590 09/06/2006		EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK			MILLER, CHERYL L	
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			3738	
			DATE MAIL ED: 00/06/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/782,982	ZUBOK ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Cheryl Miller	3738		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING INSTRUCTION OF THE MAILING O	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 I</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5) □ 6) ☒ 7) ☒ 8) □ Applicati 9) □ 10) □	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawing Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-6,8-13 and 15-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 7,14 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accompany and accompany are subjected to by the Examin The drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	er. cepted or b) objected to by the Ee drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 7/10/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

Application/Control Number: 10/782,982

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Songer et al. (US 7,001,433 B2). See figures 6a-6e and col.9 line 17-col.10 line 25. Songer discloses an artificial intervertebral disc comprising a first baseplate (82) with aperture (88), a second baseplate (84) with aperture (90), a bearing mechanism (76) coupled to the baseplates (82, 84), wherein the baseplates rotate relative the bearing mechanism, and wherein the rotation of the baseplates (82, 84) relative the bearing (76) extends the bearing mechanism through the baseplate aperture (at 78 and 80; see fig.6a; the bearing mechanism is partially extending through the aperture during rotation). Songer discloses the baseplates (82, 84) to be outwardly domed (see surfaces 82a and 84a in fig.6B, 6e, and 6f domed is clearly shown). Songer discloses the bearing surfaces of the baseplates to be semispherical (shown as so in figs).

Claims 1-5, 8-12, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by de Villiers et al. (US 2005/0021146 A1). De Villiers discloses an artificial intervertebral disc comprising a first baseplate (12) with aperture (26), a second baseplate (14) with aperture (26), a

Art Unit: 3738

bearing mechanism (16+33+34) coupled to the baseplates (12, 14), wherein the baseplates rotate relative the bearing mechanism (P0040), and wherein the rotation of the baseplate relative the bearing extends the bearing mechanism through the baseplate aperture (at 36; see figs.1-4; the bearing mechanism is partially extending through the aperture during rotation). De Villiers discloses the bearing surfaces of the baseplates and the bearing to be semispherical (P0036, P0040). De Villiers discloses the first and second baseplate apertures (26) to have a tapered edge (seen as angled in the figs), increasing the angle of rotation, wherein the bearing is not in physical contact with the tapered edge (36 does not contact surface). De Villiers discloses a bearing (16) having a spherical contour with a bore (32), a first retaining cap (top edge of sleeve 33 considered a cap) having an axial bore (sleeve 33 has a elongate opening) and passing through the first baseplate aperture (26) into the bearing bore (32), and a second retaining cap (top edge of rod 34 considered a cap) passing through the second baseplate aperture (26) into the axial bore of first retaining cap (33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Villiers et al. (US 2005/0021146 A1) in view of Heggeness et al. (US 5,514,180). De Villiers discloses artificial intervertebral discs substantially as claimed (see above), however does not

Art Unit: 3738

disclose the outer surfaces of the baseplates (12, 14) to be dome shaped. Heggeness teaches in the same field of artificial intervertebral discs, the use of dome shaped outer surfaces (ramp, saddle, irregular, bowl, and hump; all analogous to the "dome" shape claimed) placed on intervertebral replacements in order to better fit the anatomy of the body's spine (col.7, lines 2-15; col.10, lines 37-48; col.4, lines 16-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Heggeness's teaching of using contoured outer surfaces (such as domed shaped) on intervertebral replacement discs, with the replacement disc of de Villiers, in order to provide a device that more properly fits the shape of the spine and stresses are more evenly distributed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Miller whose telephone number is (571) 272-4755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/782,982 Page 5

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cheryl Miller

mf Mur

CORRINE McDERMOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700